

Categorical Exclusion (CX) Documentation
Not Established by Statute
Memorial Production Operating LLC
DOI BLM WY D030 2016 0131 CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Rawlins Field Office

Case file Serial Number: WYW-185371

Proposed Action

Title/Type: Wertz Water Injection Line pipeline / ROW Alt Water Disposal MLA

Location of Proposed Action: T. 26 N., R. 89 & 90 W. Carbon & Sweetwater

Description of Proposed Action: New ROW grant for a buried produced water pipeline that will be placed within the ROW boundaries an an existing produced water pipeline.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Record of Decision and Approved Rawlins

December 24, 2008

Resource Management

Date Approved/Amended: September 21, 2015

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

Development of oil and gas reserves is in conformance with the RMP decision as described in Section 2.3.7 Minerals (page 2-20), *Management Objectives, 2. Provide opportunities for exploration and development of conventional and unconventional oil and gas, coal, and other leasable minerals*. This project is also in conformance with Section 2.3.5 Lands and Realty (page 2-16), *Management Objectives, 6 Respond to internal and external requests (e.g., pipelines, access roads) for land authorizations*.

 The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

The Resource Management Plan was amended by the *Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for the Rocky Mountain Region, Including the Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Regions of Lewistown, North Dakota, Northwest Colorado, and Wyoming* (September 2015).

C. Compliance with NEPA

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9(E), or 43 CFR 46.210:

- (12): Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR 46.215 apply. These circumstances, and the rationale specific to this categorical exclusion, are listed and described in Table 1.

I considered the proposed Wertz Water Injection Line pipeline project and the project design features in my

evaluation, and find that the Proposed Action would not have significant impacts to the human environment.

D. SIGNATURE

Authorizing Official:



Field Manager, Rawlins Field Office

JUN 09 2016

Date

E. CONTACT PERSON/PREPARER



Anne Haverhals
Rawlins Field Office
P. O. Box 2407
Rawlins, WY 82301
307-328-4270
ahaverhals@blm.gov

Date

7 June 2016

Date

Table 1. Extraordinary Circumstances

WYW-185371

	Extraordinary Circumstances	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
(a)	Have significant impacts on public health or safety.	No	The proposed project would not affect public health or safety.
b)	Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.	No	The proposed project would not have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.
(c)	Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (National Environmental Policy Act Section 102(2)(E)).	No	The proposed project would not have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (National Environmental Policy Act Section 102(2)(E)).
(d)	Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	No	The proposed project would not have significant environmental effects or unknown risks have been identified.
(e)	Establish precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration with significant environmental effects.	No	The proposed project would not have establish precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration with significant environmental effects.
(f)	Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	No	The Proposed Action, when considered with other actions in the area, would not have cumulatively significant environmental effects to BLM lands and/or resources.
(g)	Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.	No	The proposed project would not have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.
(h)	Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical habitat for these species.	No	The proposed project would not have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical habitat for these species.
(i)	Violate a Federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	No	The Proposed Action would not violate a Federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or a requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

(j)	Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	No	The Proposed Action would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations.
(k)	Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).	No	The proposed project would not limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites.
(l)	Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).	No	As proposed, the project design features would ensure that this project would not contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species.